

an insulator wrapped about said housing wherein said insulator has
a plurality of gas exit apertures corresponding to said
plurality of gas exit orifices,

wherein ignition of said ignition body essentially provides uniform
ignition and combustion of said propellant body along the
entire length thereof.

REMARKS

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 3 and 5 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicants have added new claims 16 and 17 wherein claim 16 combines the limitations of claims 1 and 3, and claim 17 combines the limitations of claims 1 and 5. Applicants now believe claims 16 and 17 to be in condition for allowance.

The Rejections:

Claims 1, 2, and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,005,876 to Jorgensen et al. The examiner states that among other things Jorgensen describes a propellant body 10 within, and substantially coextensive with, the housing.

Jorgenson describes a plurality of propellant bodies 10, but not a propellant body having a length substantially coextensive with the housing. Accordingly, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under Jorgensen, for Jorgensen neither alone or in combination with another reference describes the limitations as affirmatively claimed in claim 1 (and in claims 6, 11, and 15). Given this distinction, applicants have not commented on the other aspects of the rejection; however, this should not be taken as an admission that the applicants ratify all other aspects of the rejection. They are not, and applicants reserve further

comment if necessary.

Claims 6, 7, 10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,315,847 to Lee et al. For the same reasons and comments given above relative to Jorgensen and the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4, (herein incorporated by reference), applicants respectfully traverse for Lee does not cure the deficiencies of Jorgensen and therefore, none of the references when taken alone or together describe with particularity all of the limitations of the claims.

Claims 8, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of Lee and U.S. Patent No. 5,827,996 to Yoshida et al. For the same reasons and comments given above relative to Jorgensen and the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4, (herein incorporated by reference), applicants respectfully traverse for neither Lee or Yoshida cure the deficiencies of Jorgensen and therefore, none of the references when taken alone or together describe with particularity all of the limitations of the claims.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of Yoshida. Again, for the same reasons and comments given above relative to Jorgensen and the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4, (herein incorporated by reference), applicants respectfully traverse for Yoshida does not cure the deficiencies of Jorgensen and therefore, none of the references when taken alone or together describe with particularity all of the limitations of claim 9.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorgensen in view of Lee and Yoshida, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,077,371 to Lundstrom et al. Again, for the same reasons and comments given above relative to Jorgensen and the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4, (herein incorporated by reference), applicants respectfully traverse for neither

Lee, Yoshida, or Lundstrom cures the deficiencies of Jorgensen and therefore, none of the references when taken alone or together describe with particularity all of the limitations of the claims.


Accordingly, applicants acknowledge the allowability of claims 16 and 17 and further courteously solicit the allowance of claims 1-15 and passage of the subject application to issue. In essence, a prima facie case of obviousness must be supported by one or more references that teach with particularity all of the limitations of the claims. In the absence thereof, a prima facie case of obviousness is simply not supported. Applicants respectfully request a phone call to the undersigned if the examiner has any further questions relative to the allowability of claims 1-15.

Concurrently herewith, applicants petition for a one-month extension for response. Our check in the amount of \$110.00 is included in payment thereof. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 04-1311. A duplicate copy of the first page of this transmittal is also enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 1/10/03

Dinnin & Dunn, P.C.
2701 Cambridge Court
Suite 500
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326

By 

Laurence C. Begin
Reg. No. 42,310
Phone (248) 364-2100
FAX (248) 364-2200